Molly Johnson

From: Susan Rohan [susanrohan@surewest.net]

Sent: Monday, August 09, 2010 3:11 PM

To: Don Duffy

Cc: Margie Koltun; Molly Johnson; Todd Nishikawa

Subject: Re: Public Hearing this week

Thanks again!!! All questions answered.

Susan

```
> From: Don Duffy <DDuffy@placer.ca.gov>
> Date: Mon, 9 Aug 2010 14:56:51 -0700
> To: Susan Rohan <susanrohan@surewest.net>
> Cc: Margie Koltun < MKoltun@placer.ca.gov>, Molly Johnson
> <MJJohnso@placer.ca.gov>, Todd Nishikawa <TNishika@placer.ca.gov>
> Subject: RE: Public Hearing this week
> These rules apply to any business that emits air pollutants into the
> air at a rate of 2 pounds per day or greater. This includes
> stationary sources (not cars or trucks) that have combustion sources
> like engines or boilers, gas stations, dry cleaners, wood coaters,
> auto painters, and many manufacturing operations that create dust or solvent fumes.
>
> New businesses generally learn of our permit requirements during the
> planning process (obtaining a use permit) or the building permit process.
>
> I scanned our permit brochure and attached it for a more thorough
> explanation of who needs a permit. Sorry, it came out upside down.
>
>
>
>
>
> ----Original Message----
> From: Susan Rohan [mailto:susanrohan@surewest.net]
> Sent: Monday, August 09, 2010 2:38 PM
> To: Don Duffy
> Cc: Margie Koltun; Molly Johnson; Todd Nishikawa
> Subject: Re: Public Hearing this week
>
> Thank you very much for your explanation.
>
> For Rule 501,503, and 504 what kinds of business are they? General
> descriptions would be very adequate. I was just curious how much the
> local chambers should be aware of this for the folks they represent.
> Susan
>
>
>> From: Don Duffy <DDuffy@placer.ca.gov>
>> Date: Mon, 9 Aug 2010 10:35:18 -0700
```

```
>> To: Susan Rohan <susanrohan@surewest.net>
>> Cc: Margie Koltun <MKoltun@placer.ca.gov>, Don Duffy
>> <DDuffy@placer.ca.gov>, Molly Johnson <MJJohnso@placer.ca.gov>, Todd
>> Nishikawa <TNishika@placer.ca.gov>
>> Subject: RE: Public Hearing this week
>>
>> Susan:
>>
>> Thank you for your interest in our proposed rule amendments. Having
>> read our staff reports on the proposed amendments, you know that the
>> reason we are proposing the rule changes is in order to gain EPA
>> approval of our permitting rules. The changes will make our rules
>> compatible with EPA and ARB environmental laws.
>>
>> All current permit holders have been notified that we are proposing
>> rule amendments by two direct mail notices. The general public has
>> been notified by notices in three area newspapers. A notice has also
>> been posted, along with staff reports and amended rules, on our website.
>>
>> Rule 501, General Permit Requirements
>>
>> This rule states who needs to obtain a permit and administrative
>> procedures for applying and granting permits. The proposed
>> amendments do not change what needs to be permitted. This rule would
>> only apply to the approximately 735 permitted sources if they add or
>> modify equipment needing permits. We do not expect any new permits to
>> be required by this amendment that would not already be required by
>> the current rule.
>>
>> Rule 504, Emission Reduction Credits
>> This rule applies to permitted sources who choose to shut down or
>> reduce emissions voluntairly. The rule specifies how to go about
>> obtaining Emission Reduction Credits. We have about 3 or 4 of these actions per year.
>>
>> Rule 503, Emission Statement
>> This rule reflects a Federal requirement that sources emitting 10 or
>> more tons per year of NOx or VOC report those emissions. This rule
>> affects approximately 15 currently permitted sources. The amendments
>> to the rule update the reporting procedure to what is currently being
>> used by the District. This will not require any additional reporting
>> beyond what is already required.
>>
>> Rule 102, Definitions
>>
>> This rule defines terms used in other District rules. The amendments
>> update some terms amended in the above rules and deletes some terms
>> no longer used in any District rules. None of the amendments require
>> permits that are not already required.
>>
>> In summary, we do not expect any additional permits to be required as
>> a result of these amendments.
>>
>>
>>
>> ----Original Message-----
```

```
>> From: Margie Koltun
>> Sent: Monday, August 09, 2010 8:37 AM
>> To: Don Duffy
>> Subject: FW: Public Hearing this week
>> Hi Don, please cc me on your response.
>>
>> Margie
>>
>>
>> ----Original Message----
>>> From: Susan Rohan [mailto:susanrohan@surewest.net]
>> Sent: Monday, August 09, 2010 8:04 AM
>> To: Placer County Air Pollution Control District
>> Subject: Public Hearing this week
>> I read the staff reports for the rule changes that are the subject of
>> a public hearing this thursday.
>>
>> I would like to know how many active permit holders there are for
>> each of the rule changes and if they have been notified of amendments.
>>
>> I would also like to know if you expect an increase in the number of
>> people needing permits as a result of this rule change.
>> Thanks!
>>
>> Susan
>
```